

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,240	10/27/2003	Jason D. Brooks	0734 US	4330
7590 04/23/2007 Richard A. Koske Fluke Corporation			EXAMINER RIVAS, SALVADOR E	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			2609	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/695,240	BROOKS, JASON D.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Salvador E. Rivas	2609			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27	October 2003.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	nis action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	osecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and 	rawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 October 2003 is/an Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	re: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected or b) ☒ objected or b) ☒ objected or b) ☒ objected or b) ☒ objection is required if the drawing(s) is objected or b) ☒ objected or	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati iority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	·			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/695,240

Art Unit: 2609

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: block 118 and block 120 from Fig.2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/695,240

Art Unit: 2609

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haneda (U.S. Patent Application Publication #2002/0167914 A1) in view of Bearden et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication #2003/0086425 A1).

Consider claim 1, Bearden et al. disclose a method of identifying a bridge uplink port in a network, comprising the steps of: sending an SNMP query to a selected bridge to retrieve stored contents of a forwarding data base table of said selected bridge ([0112] and [0145]) and for any interface index retrieved from said selected bridge, identifying a port associated with said interface index as an uplink port of an adjacent bridge ([0150]).

However, Bearden et al. fails to disclose sending an ICMP ping to all known bridges within said network and thereby causing forwarding data base tables of said bridges to store MAC addresses and interface indices of adjacent bridges

In the same field of endeavor, Haneda show cases a method whereby an ICMP echo message ([0009]-[0010]) as a detection signal sent to a number of nodes (e.g.: bridges and routers) within a network and set up a data format in the form of an address-list file that will be stored on a given memory ([0035]).

Application/Control Number: 10/695,240

Art Unit: 2609

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate an ICMP echo message as a detection signal as shown by Haneda in the method of Bearden et al. for the purpose of managing network topologies by monitoring and analyzing possible data paths for efficient data transfer in a network.

Consider **claim 2**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Bearden et al. as modified by Hadena, discloses a method of further identifying a bridge uplink port in a network further comprising the steps of: (d) downloading the contents of all of said forwarding data base tables of said known bridges ([0115]); (e) counting a number of MAC addresses associated with each port of said bridges ([0107]-[108]); and (f) identifying a port as an uplink port if said number of MAC addresses counted exceeds a predetermined number ([0118]-[119] and [0150]).

Conclusion

3. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to** (571) 273-8300 **or mailed to**:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or early communications from the Examiner should be directed to Salvador E. Rivas whose telephone number is (571)

Application/Control Number: 10/695,240 Page 5

Art Unit: 2609

270-1784. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30AM to

5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's

supervisor, Rafael Perez-Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272- 7915. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone

number is (571) 272-2600.

Salvador E. Rivas S.E.R./ser

April 17, 2007

RAPAEL PÉREZ-GUTIERREZ SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

4/10/07